

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

The Examiner maintains there are two patentably distinct groups of inventions in this application, identified as follows:

**Group I:** Claims 1-13 and 24-25, drawn to an apparatus for disintegrating degradable or non-degradable material.

**Group II:** Claims 14-23, drawn to an apparatus for the transmission of power from a motor to a functional unit.

Applicants provisionally elect the claims of Group II.

Applicants traverse the restriction requirement on the basis that the two groups of claims relate to technology based on power transmission devices. Thus there appears to be overlapping technical subject matter in the classes identified by the examiner for Groups I and II. Applicants thus submit that a search and examination of the claims of Group I would probably overlap or encompass the search field for the claims of Group II.

Applicants further submit that a simultaneous search for the two groups of claims can probably be made without substantial increase of the search effort.

Accordingly, it is believed that the following guidelines of MPEP §803 are applicable,

*“If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.”*

Withdrawal of the restriction requirement and simultaneous examination of both groups of claims are thus respectfully requested.

Dated: January 19, 2009  
RODMAN & RODMAN  
10 Stewart Place – Suite 2CE  
White Plains, New York 10603  
Telephone: (914) 949-7210  
Facsimile: (914) 993-0668  
1112-02 Response to Restriction Requirement

Respectfully submitted,  
/Philip Rodman/  
Philip Rodman, Reg. No. 25,704  
Attorney for Applicants